

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/661,281

Applicant(s)

MOHRI ET AL.

Examiner

Ishwar (I. B.) Patel

Art Unit

2841

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ishwar (I. B.) Patel.

(3) Kentaro Kamiya. *Kentaro Kamiya*

(2) Nathaniel McQueen (Reg. 53,308). *NM*

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 May 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 33,34 and 36-43.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative explained the claimed invention in detail and that of independent claim 33 in particular. The rejection with the prior art of Hamzehdoost and Bitailou were discussed. It was noticed that prior art of Bitailou is not reading on the claimed structure. Agreement could not be reached with respect to the rejection with the prior art of Hamzehdoost. Also, discussed was the 112 2nd paragraph rejection. The applicant is amending the claim language to overcome the 112 2nd paragraph rejection.. Decision of the allowability will be taken after receiving the amendment .